SchoolWorks

TENNESSEE
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

2020-21
Authorizer Evaluation Guide

208 College Highway, Box 7
Southwick, Massachusetts 01077
978-921-1647 www.schoolworks.org

Contents

About this Document 1
Purpose 2
Product 2
Ratings 3
Evaluation Staffing 5
Evaluation Team Responsibilities 5
Abide by the Code of Conduct 5
Keep Aware of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) 5
Consider Conflicts of Interest 5
Document Folder 5
Evaluation Cycle – Each Authorizer 6
Pre-Evaluation 6
Steps in the Process (Team) 6
Completion of Evaluation 9
Evaluation Step-by-Step 10
Document Review – (Days One & Two) 10
Document Review Requirements: 10
Document Review Process: 10
School Leader Documentation Debrief & Pre-Debrief Call (Day Three) 11
Authorizer Documentation Debrief (Day Four) 12
Consensus Call (Day Four) 14
Report-Out Preliminary Ratings (Day Five) 17
Writing (Day Five) 17
Findings and Evaluative comments 17
Exemplar Comments 18
Authorizer Documents and Submission Process 12
Authorizer Documentation Debrief Script 21

About this Document

This document provides supplementary guidance to the Tennessee State Board of Education (TSBE) authorizer evaluators and is aligned to TSBE training materials. This guide will be updated from time-to-time if TSBE provides additional guidance as to the standards for evaluation; evaluators should always rely on the most recent form of guidance.

Part I: Introduction

The Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation is based on quality practices as defined by the Tennessee Quality Charter Authorizing Standards adopted by TSBE. The Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric and evaluation process is designed by SchoolWorks with TSBE and is based on authorizing best practices as well as on the expertise that SchoolWorks brings to the process. A task force included members from TSBE, authorizer representatives from Metro Nashville Public Schools, Shelby County Schools, Achievement School District, Knoxville County Schools, and Hamilton County Schools, as well as representatives from the Tennessee Charter School Center and the Nashville Charter Collaborative.

SchoolWorks, an education consulting company with national experience in charter school authorizer accountability, was contracted by TSBE to produce independent scoring of the 24 rubric standards within the approved Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric for all Tennessee charter school authorizers. Pilot evaluations will be conducted in Fall 2020, with the ratings being presented in a report. TSBE and SchoolWorks worked together to develop an orientation, training, and reliable evaluation process for consistent use in all evaluations.

Process

In Fall 2020, TSBE will conduct pilot evaluations of two-to-three authorizers. Every authorizer will have the opportunity to participate as a team member in the pilot. The results from the pilot will used as a baseline to gauge thresholds for overall ratings.

In Fall 2021, TSBE will begin formal evaluations of authorizers. Evaluations will be staggered and occur bi-annually, with three authorizers evaluated in 2021 and the other three authorizers in 2022. This sequence repeats into the future. Authorizers being evaluated will submit documents in advance and participate in a documentation debrief during a predetermined timeframe. Off-year authorizers may participate on one evaluation team, and authorizer team member assignments will be staggered in subsequent evaluation cycles.

The Cohort model – Evaluated (Authorizer evaluation team member)

2021	2022
○ A (F)	○ D (B)
○ B (E)	○ E (A)
○ C (D)	○ F (C)

Evaluation teams consider only the documented evidence submitted for the evaluation to determine rubric scores of two or higher on each standard. After an initial evaluation of submitted materials, authorizers have the option to engage in a documentation debrief meeting with the evaluation teams for the purpose of understanding documentation.

In determining scores, evaluators default to a rating of zero – the lowest score – when no documents are submitted to address a given standard. Evaluators examine all documents and determine which performance level of the rubric best represents the authorizer's practice.

The report provides brief statements to describe the nature of the documented evidence. Comments also note cases in which no relevant documents were provided by the authorizer.

While a common process to ensure a consistent and normed evaluation has been collaboratively developed by TSBE and SchoolWorks, evaluations of the 24 rubric standards for each authorizer will be conducted solely by the evaluation teams and represent an independent evaluation of each authorizer's practice in relation to the rubrics' standards.

Purpose

The evaluation team is responsible for objectively evaluating the evidence documentation submitted for a given authorizer by comparing the evidence of the documentation of the authorizer's processes and performance against the rubric. **Documentation considered for the evaluation is limited to the documents submitted by the authorizer, the school leader survey, the school leader interview, and the documentation debrief.**

Product

The evaluation is based on the 24 Tennessee Quality Charter Authorizing Standards, which will be rated in 5 categories (e.g., 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a). The evaluation process rating is based on the evaluation team's consideration of standards (not principles, advanced standards, or sub-standards). Category/Standard #6, Advanced Standards, will only be considered as extra credit.

Categories:

1. Agency Commitment and Capacity
2. Application Process and Decision Making
3. Performance Contracting
4. Ongoing Oversight and Evaluation
5. Revocation and Renewal Decision Making
6. *(not rated) Advanced Standards*

The final product of each evaluation is a completed Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric with final ratings and evaluative comments (completed by the Evaluation Lead and Team Members) as displayed in Chart A. The TSBE Quality Editor evaluates and verifies the evidence and rating for each standard (e.g., Standard 2a - Application proposal information, questions, and guidance).

Chart A:

Tennessee's Charter School Authorizer Evaluation 2020 *Authorizer:*

Standard 2a - Application proposal information, questions, and guidance **Sub-standards**		*Document Debrief*	*Narrative*	*Documentation*	*Fully Satisfied?*
i. Issues a charter application information packet or request for proposals (RFP) that: a. States any chartering priorities the authorizer may have established; b. Articulates comprehensive application questions to elicit the information needed for rigorous evaluation of applicants' plans and capacities; and c. Provides clear guidance and requirements regarding application content and format, while explaining evaluation criteria.					
ii. Welcomes proposals from first-time charter applicants as well as existing school operators/replicators, while appropriately distinguishing between the two kinds of applicants in proposal requirements and evaluation criteria.					
iii. Encourages expansion and replication of charter schools that demonstrate academic success, financial viability, organizational health, and capacity for growth.					
iv. Considers diverse educational philosophies and approaches.					
v. Requires applicants to demonstrate capacity to serve students with diverse needs, such as students with disabilities or learning exceptionalities and English learners.					
	0	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Rating					
Evaluative Comments: i. ii. iii. iv. v.					

Ratings

Rating each standard

Each standard is rated by the evaluation team as 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4, and each standard is made up of sub-standards. Sub-standards within each standard are not individually rated and are considered as met or not met. The rating scale is used to differentiate between the evidence the evaluators need to consider to differentiate quality between authorizers.

TSBE has set a specific standard of evidence that must be followed for this evaluation.

1. Only documented practices can serve as evidence to determine a rating of two or greater on the rubric.
   - Accept all documents, even if developed by outside entities, as the authorizer's documents.
   - If you have conflicting documents, use your professional judgment to determine which document contains stronger evidence.
   - A single document may serve as sufficient evidence of a practice. Authorizers vary greatly in the number of schools they oversee, so you may anticipate more examples from a larger authorizer, but you may use a single document as evidence to justify a score.
2. Narratives describing practice are most useful when accompanied by direct documentation. For example, a narrative describing the charter application and process unaccompanied by the actual application document can only achieve a rating of one.
3. The authorizer documentation debrief is an opportunity for an authorizer to identify how the documentation it has uploaded for the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation aligns with the criteria within the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric. Documentation takes priority to explanations by the authorizer during the documentation debrief. For example, an authorizer may verbally explain how they handle conflicts of interest in a convincing and coherent manner, but if no documentation is provided to corroborate their verbal comments, there would be no impact on your scoring.
   - In this case, acknowledge the documentation debrief evidence, and then state that there is no documentation to support this practice. EXAMPLE: "While the authorizer verbally described collecting data from the Dean of Academics during onsite reviews, authorizer documentation does not corroborate this practice."
   - Conversely, if an authorizer submits an excellent document, but in the documentation debrief, it becomes clear that the authorizer does not understand the document, evaluators will still base the rating on the document. No clarifying statement should be made in the report.

When determining the rating for a standard, the review team considers three things: 1. Whether the authorizer has explained practices in the documentation debrief or narrative; 2. Whether documentation consistent with the standard exists; and 3. Whether the documentation aligns with the standards.

0	1	2	3	4
Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation: • Addresses the standard and • Satisfies none of the sub-standards	**Document Debrief, Narrative and/or Documentation:** • Addresses less than 50% of sub-standards and • Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	**Documentation:** • Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards, • Satisfies less than 50% of the sub-standards	**Documentation:** • Addresses 50 to 100% of the sub-standards • Satisfies 50 to 99.9% of the sub-standards	**Documentation:** • Addresses 100% of the sub-standards • Satisfies 100% of the sub-standards

Authorizer's Overall Rating: As an outcome of the evaluation, each authorizer earns an individual overall rating. This overall rating is determined by TSBE's ratings of standards and noted by a number representing their percent alignment to TSBE's Quality Charter Authorizing Standards. Each of the 24 individual standards can earn up to 4 points, 96 possible points, none weighted. Four (4) extra credit points, in addition to the 96, are possible via the advanced standards. The overall rating is the percentage points earned out of 96. Example: Authorizer X's TSBE Evaluation Rating = 73

Score	Rating
tbd	Exemplary
tbd	Commendable
tbd	Satisfactory
tbd	Approaching Satisfactory
tbd	Unsatisfactory/Incomplete

Evaluation Staffing

Evaluation Team and Support

Evaluation Lead *(Evaluation Team)* – Reviews all documents, generates rubric ratings, reviews team member rubrics, facilitates the school leader interview and documentation debrief, presents during the consensus meeting and report out, writes the report, and responds to quality editor's report feedback.

Team Members *(Evaluation Team)* – Reviews all documents, generates rubric ratings, takes notes during the documentation debrief, and participates in the consensus meeting.

TSBE Quality Editor – Participates in the consensus meeting, reviews the draft report and, if needed, reviews updated report from lead. Shares the report with the authorizer.

TSBE Project Manager – Manages evaluation logistics, reviews and edits the final report, shares the report with authorizer, and updates the report to reflect authorizer's feedback.

Copy Editor – Copy edits the report.

Evaluation Team Responsibilities

Evaluation:

- Review ALL documents submitted by the authorizer.
- Compare all evidence relevant to each standard against the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric.
- Discuss the evidence and reach to consensus on ratings.
- Evaluation Lead finalizes the rubric based on the consensus meeting with his/her team member.

Abide by the Code of Conduct

1. Carry out work with integrity.
   a. Treat all those you encounter with courtesy and sensitivity. Try to minimize stress.
   b. Allay anxiety through mutual respect and valuing opinions. Show an interest in what is said/presented.
   c. Focus attention and questions on topics that will reveal the quality of an authorizer's practices.
2. Act in the best interests of authorizers.
   a. Do not put participants in a position where they may have conflicting loyalties.
   b. Evaluations are confidential until their public release.
   c. Try to understand what authorizers are doing and why. Be supportive.
3. Be objective; base findings on evidence, not opinion.
   a. Evaluations must be robust, fully supported by evidence, defensible, and must inform the ratings.
   b. Evaluations must be reliable in that others would make the same conclusion from the same evidence.

Keep Aware of the Tennessee Open Records Act

- This project is limited to one hard copy deliverable (completed rubric).
- Do not make copies of the rubric. The process is designed to allow for the editing of the rubric at each stage of the evaluation.
- In addition, do not email your team members with comments and questions pertaining to the ratings for any authorizer. Discuss your ratings during the allotted times, or schedule additional times.

Consider Conflicts of Interest

- Review documents for conflicts or perceived conflicts. If a conflict (or a question) exists, contact the TSBE Project Manager prior to engaging in the evaluation.

Document Folder

- Please do not generate multiple documents. Save/update the rubric within the folder.

Evaluation Cycle – Each Authorizer

Pre-Evaluation (Summer/early Fall)
During the summer prior to evaluations, TSBE conducts an orientation for authorizers regarding the standards, ratings, documents, evaluation process, and submission process. Every authorizer being evaluated that year is required to attend; off-year authorizers may attend if they please.

In late summer or early fall, SchoolWorks will support the training of TSBE's evaluation team members. Evaluator training is mandatory and will occur approximately one month prior to the first evaluation. The training occurs annually and includes:

- An overview of the evaluation and scoring processes
- A review of the rubric
- Norming on ratings and the writing of evaluative comments

TSBE will contact the authorizer in advance of the documentation debrief to schedule the dates and times, provide debrief logistics, and request a list of the standards the authorizer plans to discuss during the documentation debrief. The authorizer will provide TSBE with the names of documentation debrief participants.

TSBE will also contact the school leaders from the authorizer's portfolio in advance of the evaluation to distribute a survey and to schedule the dates and times for the school leader interview and provide debrief logistics.

In early fall, authorizers will submit documents (document information is described later)

Each authorizer evaluation follows a similar process. These are the steps to complete as a Lead, Team Member, or Quality Editor.

Table 1: Steps in the Process (Team)

Days	Lead	Team Members	Quality Editor
Day 1 (Monday) *or sooner if you want to start early*	**Access Documents** • Documents are available to the evaluation team one week prior to the evaluation. • Access documents and click on the corresponding authorizer folder.	**Access Documents** • Access documents and click on the corresponding authorizer folder.	
Days 1-2 (Mon-Tues)	**Document Review** • Review documents • Rate all standards • Draft evaluative comments for every standard	**Document Review** • Review documents • Rate all standards • Draft evaluative comments for every standard	
Day 3 (Wed)	**School Leader Interview (AM)** • Documentation debrief – AM, virtual (60 minutes) hard-scheduled. • Pose standardized questions to the authorizer's school leaders **Pre-debrief call (PM)** • Combine rubrics to one. • Pre-debrief call (90 minutes) via phone	**School Leader Interview (AM)** • Documentation debrief – AM, virtual (60 minutes) hard-scheduled. • Listen to standardized questions to the authorizer's school leaders • Record answers to questions **Pre-debrief call (PM)** • Pre-debrief call (90 minutes) via phone	

Day 4 (PM)	**Authorizer Documentation debrief (AM)** *(optional)*
	• Documentation debrief in-person (up to 2 hours) hard-scheduled.
	  ○ Facilitate meeting
	  ▪ Present scripted meeting introduction
		Authorizer Documentation debrief (AM) *(optional)*
		• Documentation debrief in-person (up to 2 hours) hard-scheduled.
		  ○ Take notes of authorizer responses in note-taking template.
		• Post-documentation debrief (30 minutes)
		Consensus Meeting (PM)
			Consensus Meeting (PM)
			• Leads the call
			• Skim ratings/findings before call
			• Two-hour phone call (hard scheduled).
			• Listen to presentation:
			  ○ Clarify ratings as needed.
			  ○ Clarify evidence as needed.

	▪ The authorizer identifies the standards to be discussed and presents/discusses the evidence ▪ Present scripted closing/ next steps • Post-documentation debrief (30 minutes) **Consensus Meeting (PM)** • Two-hour phone call (hard scheduled). • Present the consensus findings to Quality Editor • Per discussion, note adjustments to rubric ratings to prepare for writing.	• Two-hour phone call (hard scheduled). • Participate fully under direction of Lead. *(Following the consensus meeting, the Team Members are done.)*	
Day 5 (Friday)	**Report out findings** • Report of the 24 preliminary ratings; • Provide the Authorizer with a summary of the team's ratings. • 30 minutes, virtual **Write and submit the Rubric** • Complete the rubric ratings and language consistent with writing guidance. • Finalize completed rubric and save it to the document folder <u>by or before 5:00 p.m. **Monday**</u>. • Email Quality Editor to notify them that evaluation is ready for quality editing.		
Day 8-10 (Mon-Wed)			**Quality editing** • Access draft via the document folder and conduct the initial review of rubric. • Make terminology and/or grammatical edits to drafted evaluative comments. • Complete review and save to the document folder <u>by or before 5:00 p.m. **Wednesday**</u>. • Send an email to the Lead and PM to notify them that quality editing has been completed. • *(if needed) Notify PM at this point with clarification questions.*
Day 10-11 (Wed-Thurs)	**Quality editing** (continued) • Access draft via the document folder to review Quality Editor's changes • Update the evaluation according to comments/suggestions from the Quality Editor. • Finalize edits and save updated rubric to the document folder <u>by or before 5:00 p.m. **Thursday**</u>. • Email the Quality Editor to notify them that the updates have been completed.		
Day 12 (Friday)	**Finalizing the rubric report and submission** • Access any updates via the document folder and conduct the final edits to update and finalize the rubric. • Delete any remaining editing comments.		**(only as needed) Finalizing the rubric report and submission** • Access draft via the document folder and conduct the final edits to update and finalize the rubric.

	• Once notified by Quality Editor, finalize and save updated rubric to the document folder, by or before noon **Monday**. • Email the Quality Editor to notify them of completion. *(Following this step, the Evaluation Lead is done.)*		• Delete any remaining editing comments. • Finalize and save updated rubric to the document folder, by or before noon **Friday**. • Email the Lead to notify them of completion. *(Following this step, the Quality Editor is done.)*

Completion of Evaluation

1. **Project Manager - Evaluation rubric**
   - Access rubric via the document folder and eliminate any remaining editorial comments.
   - Finalize and save updated rubric to the document folder by or before 9:00 a.m. Wednesday.
   - Email the Copy Editor to notify him/her of completion.
2. **Copy Editor**
   - Access rubric via the document folder and conduct copy editing of rubric.
   - Review grammar and formatting.
   - Finalize and save the final document as "[authorizer name] Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Report - DRAFT" in the document folder by or before 9:00 a.m. Friday.
   - Email the Project Manager to notify him/her of completion. Following this step, the Copy Editor is done.
3. **Project Manager - Review and save**
   - Access rubric via the document folder and review rubric.
   - Save the final document as "[authorizer name] Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Report - DRAFT" in the document folder by or before 9:00 a.m. Monday.
   - Final distribution - Access rubric via the document folder, share the final document as "[authorizer name] Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Report - DRAFT" with authorizer.
   - Requesting Report Content Clarifications (Authorizer)
     - In the interest of producing as accurate a report as possible, the authorizer is offered an opportunity to review the draft and submit any errors of a factual nature they may find.
     - The draft is shared with the authorizer in PDF form. Edit suggestions may include names, dates, historical references, program titles, or numbers of schools, etc. The findings expressed in the report at this point are not subject to substantive change and substantiated edit recommendations will be reflected in the final version of the report. The authorizer's review of the draft evaluation is expected to be internal since the report, at the point of review, is not available for distribution. The authorizer should submit suggested edits in a separate message, indicating page number and paragraph number (if possible).
     - Following the pilot evaluations, TSBE will survey the authorizers for feedback on the process.

Evaluation Step-by-Step

Document Review – (Days One & Two)

Document Review Requirements:
By or before the end of day two, each evaluator must:

- Review every document uploaded by the authorizer
- Draft ratings for all 24 standards within the rubric
- Draft evaluative comments for all 24 standards within the rubric

Document Review Process:
Each evaluator will work on his/her own copy of the rubric on Days One and Two. Rubrics are in the document folder fielder under subfolders called "Rubrics."

The Evaluation Lead and Team Members conduct independent reviews during days One and Two.

For each standard, the Evaluation Lead and Team Members must:

- Review all authorizer documentation in the document folder for the standard.
- Determine whether the standard applies to the authorizer.
- If the standard does not apply, then rate the standard as "n/a."
- If the standard applies:
  - Review the criteria and guidance, then determine a draft rating.
  - Draft evaluative comments for every applicable criterion in the standard.
    Evaluation suggestions:
    - Craft evaluative comments consistent with the writing section.
      - ✓ Make general reference to documents per the writing guidance.
      - ✓ Add page references (in parentheses) to evaluative comments for referenced document. These page references are used for consensus discussions on Day Three and must be struck by the Evaluation Lead when finalizing the evaluation.
        For example:
        - *While PowerPoint slides [21, 24, and 56] from the authorizer's school training session include descriptions of staff responsibilities for every phase of the authorizer's oversight plan, the training session is dated January 2015 and therefore does not apply to the period of this evaluation.*
- <u>Team Members</u> - Once the document review and draft evaluative comments have been completed for 24 standards, notify the Evaluation Lead.
- <u>Evaluation Lead</u> - once notified by Team Members of their completion:
  - Review the Team Members' ratings and evaluative comments.
  - Identify inconsistent ratings for pre-documentation debrief consensus call.
  - *Delete the TEAM MEMBER rubrics after the report is drafted.*

Tips for reviewing documents.

- Some evaluators find it useful to print a copy of the blank rubric for reference. This can be helpful when you are in the authorizer document on your computer and simultaneously want to check several sections of the rubric.

Tips for writing evaluative comments:

- *See pages 18-19 for writing guidance.*

School Leader Interview & Pre-Debrief Call (Day Three)

School Leader Interview

Overview:

- The interview is an opportunity for school leaders from the authorizer's portfolio to respond to questions regarding their authorizer's expectations and practices.
- School leader interview time is limited to one hour.
- The school leader interview is optional.

Participants:

- School leaders and Evaluation Team

When:

- The school leader interview is conducted on Wednesday morning.
- The Project Manager schedules the interview.

Where:

- The interview is conducted remotely; school leaders and evaluators will participate in the meeting.
- Interview participants may engage in the meeting from multiple locations.
- The Project Manager will send a calendar invitation to the school leaders in advance of every interview. Meeting invitations will contain meeting access info.

Pre-Debrief Consensus Call

Purpose:

- The evaluation team will achieve rating consensus and (ideally) evidence consensus for all 24 standards.

Participants:

- Evaluation Team

When:

- The pre-debrief consensus call is conducted on Wednesday midday or afternoon.
- The Project Manager schedules the pre-debrief consensus call.

Where:

- The pre-debrief consensus call is conducted remotely. Evaluators will participate in the meeting remotely. The Evaluation Lead will share the quality evaluation rubric.
- Meeting participants may engage in the meeting from multiple locations.
- The Project Manager will send a calendar invitation to the school leaders in advance of every meeting. Meeting invitations will contain meeting access info.

What:

- Evaluators connect on the phone for up to 90 minutes.
- Review the rating and evaluative comment (evidence) for each of the 24 standards:
  - For standards with consensus, confirm rating and evidence (*no more than 1 minute per standard*)
  - For standards without consensus:
    - ✓ Determine which evidence applies,
    - ✓ Discuss how the (agreed-to) evidence aligns with rubric ratings, and
    - ✓ Determine and confirm team rating.
- *Time permitting* - Edit evaluative comments.

Authorizer Documentation Debrief (Day Four)

Overview:

- The authorizer documentation debrief is an opportunity for a charter school authorizer to identify how the documentation they have uploaded for the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation aligns with the criteria within the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric.
- Authorizers can set the agenda for the documentation debrief by identifying the standards they would like to discuss. With each selected standard, an authorizer may present to evaluators how the documentation they uploaded meets the criteria within the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric.

Pre-work - Responsibilities:

- The Project Manager will:
  - Contact the authorizer a month prior to the documentation debrief to:
    - Schedule the documentation debrief dates and time.
    - Provide meeting access information.
    - Request a list of the standards the authorizer plans to discuss during the meeting.
- Evaluators will:
  - Review and consider every document the authorizer has uploaded,
  - Draft ratings and evaluative comments for every standard, and
  - Engage in a pre-debrief consensus call.
  - The Evaluation Lead combines rubrics.
- The authorizer will:
  - Confirm the meeting date and time,
  - Provide the Project Manager with the names of documentation debrief participants, and
  - Submit a list of the standards the organization plans to discuss during the documentation debrief.

Note: Authorizers may find it beneficial to list standards for discussion in prioritized order

Participants:

- The authorizer may choose up to five individuals to participate in the authorizer documentation debrief. Typical documentation debrief participants are staff members or consultants who have actively implemented the organization's authorizing responsibilities.
- <u>School staff should not participate in the documentation debrief.</u>

When:

- Authorizer documentation debriefs are conducted on Thursday mornings.
- The Project Manager schedules the documentation debrief date and time with the authorizer.
- Documentation debriefs last up to two hours.

Where:

- The authorizer documentation debrief is conducted in-person. Authorizer staff and evaluators participate in the meeting.
- The Project Manager will send a calendar invitation to the authorizer and evaluators in advance of every authorizer documentation debrief. Meeting invitations will contain an address and room number.

Steps:

- The authorizer documentation debrief will be conducted for up to two hours.
- The Evaluation Lead will deliver the welcome and facilitate the introductions of meeting participants. S/he will review meeting ground rules, then verify the standards the authorizer plans to discuss. (See script below.)
- The authorizer can discuss how the evidence it has uploaded that satisfies the criteria within the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric.
- The SchoolWorks Evaluation Lead will present the closing and next steps of the evaluation as the final segment of the meeting. Documentation debriefs are limited to two hours in length and the evaluation team reserves the final five minutes of each documentation debrief for their closing remarks.

Documentation Debrief Rules:

- The evaluation team reserves the first 15 minutes and last 5 minutes of the documentation debrief for its use.
- Authorizers may select as many standards as they like to discuss during the documentation debrief.
  - The authorizer has up to 100 minutes to present to evaluators.
  - For any selected standard, authorizers are expected to discuss the evidence (documentation) they have uploaded.
  - Authorizers will discuss how their evidence/documentation meets the criteria listed in the corresponding section of the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric.
  - The amount of time an authorizer allocates to the presentation of documentation relative to any one standard is determined by them. Authorizers may not use more than the 100 minutes allocated to them.

Authorizer Documentation Debrief Script **[see page 21]**

Consensus Call (Day Four)

Purpose: The evaluation team uses the consensus call to present ratings and evidence to the Quality Editor and receive normed feedback to incorporate into the final report.

Basics

- Consensus calls are conducted virtually on Thursday afternoons and are limited to two hours.
- The Evaluation Lead, Team Members, and Quality Editor participate in the call.

Preparation:

- The Project Manager will schedule a call time and send a calendar invite. The invite will contain any meeting access information.
- The Evaluation Lead needs to update the rubric prior to the call.
  - The rubric must have a rating for every standard; do not leave any undecided.
  - Every standard must have evaluative comments consistent with every rating.
  - The rubric must reflect any discussions and adjustments made following the authorizer documentation debrief.
  - The rubric must be free of notes or comments; make sure it is clean.
- The Evaluation Lead saves the rubric to the document folder in advance of the meeting, then shares the rubric on his/her screen so all participants can view the same document during the call.
- Template email below.

Consensus Call

- The Evaluation Lead leads the call (no more than two hours).
- The Evaluation Lead presents every standard rating and its evidence in order. Present in order to ensure that every standard is covered, and none are forgotten. Allow participants one-or-two-minutes to silently read the evaluative comments.
- The Team Members are expected to clarify the presentation, as needed, and work with the Evaluation Lead to achieve consensus ratings supported with authorizer evidence.
- The Quality Editor listens to the presentation and asks clarifying questions when the evidence base for a rating is not apparent or reliant on evidence inconsistent with other evaluations.

Call Agenda

(Led by the Evaluation Lead)

A. Welcome (1 minute)
B. Purpose of Call/Review of Agenda (4 minutes)
   - Present consensus on the ratings, and evidence for every standard (in sequential order).
   - Clarify ratings that are not normed or support with sufficient evidence.
   - Prepare the Evaluation Lead to finalize the rubric.
C. Review of Each Standard (4+ minutes per standard = 115 minutes)
D. Confirm final report delivery deadline – Monday 5:00 p.m. in the document folder.

Quality Editor Responsibilities

Prep:

- Accept the document folder invite.
- Rely on Additional Guidance as a reference while each standard is presented.
- Listen clearly.
- Ask questions to confirm that ratings that are not normed or supported with sufficient evidence.

Scenarios to help with consensus:

- Scenario 1: The pre-documentation debrief document review indicates the authorizer has uploaded one site visit report per school. During the documentation debrief, the authorizer says it conducts two visits to every school per year, but only offered one report per school "as an example."
  - **Q - Do we raise the score from what we determined based on the documents alone?**
  - **A - NO, but add an evaluative comment identifying what was said during the documentation debrief.**
    Ex: *During the documentation debrief, the authorizer stated that it conducts two site visits to every school; however, authorizer documentation includes one site visit report per school.*

- Scenario 2: The document review indicates strong/clear artifacts and a high pre-rating. During the documentation debrief, the authorizer offers a response that is inconsistent with the artifacts.
  - **Q - Do we lower the score from what we determined based on the documents alone?**
  - **A - NO. There is no need to note anything about this regarding what the authorizer verbalized during the documentation debrief.**

Report-Out Preliminary Ratings (Day Five)

Purpose:

- Report the preliminary ratings for each of the 24 standards and provide the authorizer with a summary of the team's ratings.

Who:

- TSBE evaluation lead and the authorizer

Where:

- In-person or virtual, location TBD by TSBE

When:

- 30-45-minute report-out of the team's ratings to the authorizer on Friday morning. TSBE Project Manager schedules the meeting date and time with the evaluation lead and the authorizer.

Guidance:

- Maintain a warm, professional tone throughout the report-out. You may wish to begin by thanking authorizer for their collaboration, openness, and/or hospitality during the process.
- Provide a concise evidence-based summary of each rating.
- Identify two-to-three key pieces of evidence that you will discuss to support each rating before the report-out. This is particularly important for findings you anticipate will be difficult for the authorizer to hear and/or accept.
- Allow the authorizer to ask questions to clarify evidence. Respond to those questions clearly and concisely.
- Explain remaining steps:
    - We will now finalize our ratings and evaluative comments.
    - TSBE will distribute final evaluations to all authorizers in late Fall.
    - Once you receive your final evaluation, you will have an opportunity to make factual corrections.

Writing (Day Five)

Findings and Evaluative Comments

This section outlines the process for, and provides clarification on, completing the final version of the rubric.

- Every applicable sub-standard needs an evaluative comment.
- **All evaluative comments should**:
  - Identify the (in general terms) applicable documentation used to determine the rating for a standard.
  - Clearly note how the evidence aligns to the criteria of the given rating level.
  - Include enough detail for authorizers and citizens to grasp the reasons for the ratings.
- If no appropriate documents were submitted, the evaluative comment should make this clear.
- Evaluative comments **must not include** evidence or details inconsistent with the metrics in the rubric.
- **What should I keep in mind when I finalize evaluative comments?**
  - Make general references to a document in every evaluative comment.
  - A document name or its type should be the subject of an evaluative comment.
  - Avoid using file names. Instead use the common name of the document, such as contract, application, renewal application, termination policy, etc.
    Example:
    - *The authorizer guide includes descriptions for the authorizer's three staff positions; the guide details responsibilities for each position.*
    - When the quality of a document does not fully meet the criteria, then a negative comment must be generated. For example:
      - *While PowerPoint slides from a school training session include descriptions of staff responsibilities for every phase of the authorizer's oversight plan, the training session is titled Smith High School orientation which is not an authorized school and, therefore, does not apply to the evaluation.*
- When narrative content refers to a practice or expectation that is not reflected in documentation, it has little impact on the score. Evaluators can add a comment to recognize that the authorizer described the practices, even if it was not documented.
  Example:
  - *While the narrative states that the authorizer conducts two site visits to every school per year, the authorizer's documentation does not include reports or other evidence to corroborate the narrative.*
- When the authorizer says a practice or expectation occurs in the documentation debrief, but it is not reflected in documentation, their verbal comment has little impact on the score. Evaluators should include a comment to recognize that the authorizer described the practices, even if it was not documented.
  Example:
  - *During the documentation debrief, the authorizer stated that they conduct two site visits to every school, every year; however, documentation does not corroborate this practice.*

  Example:
  - *During the documentation debrief, the authorizer stated that it communicates daily with the school and tries to complete formal evaluations monthly; however, documentation does not corroborate this practice.*
- **Always** check evaluative comments against the rubric language to ensure they are appropriately aligned.

Sample Sentence Frames

- The practice of ___ is articulated in [document name]
- According to [document name], the authorizer does/does not …
- …the [document name] does/does not include…
- *Zero* - The authorizer's documentation does not demonstrate/include that…
- *Mixed* - While the _____ shows _____, the authorizer's documentation does not demonstrate/include _____...

Recommended verbs:

- Documents, articulates, demonstrates, records, makes evident…

Exemplar Comments

Insufficient Documentation

Rubric Criterion: "The authorizer submitted at least one documented policy and process for its oversight and evaluation system, but there is no evidence that this information was shared with the authorizer's schools." [Oversight & Evaluation]

Exemplar Evaluative Comment
While the site visit tool indicates that limited areas of academics and operations are reviewed on site at least one time, documentation does not demonstrate a system of oversight. Additionally, the authorizer stated in the documentation debrief that it communicates daily with the school and tries to complete formal evaluations monthly; however, their documentation does not reflect this.

Alignment with Rubric Metrics

Rubric Criterion: "All reviewed contracts include targets that compare the school's student performance to the State, schools serving similar populations or schools in the same geographic area." [Performance Contracting]

Exemplar Evaluative Comment
Each of the three contracts contain specific targets for attendance, performance on State assessments, and graduation rates. The contract template also requires each school to define an additional site-specific academic measure in the "Other Goals" section of the performance framework.

Style Guidance

1. Font – Arial, 11 point
2. Do not use or insert page numbers.
3. School year references – SY2018-19 always. [do not use… "during the 2018-2019 school year" ...]
4. Italics – DO NOT use italics to identify reports.
5. Decimals – Always include a zero in front of every decimal. Ex: 0.3%.
6. When an acronym appears the first time, spell it out and list acronym in parenthesis. For example, English Learners (EL).
7. Board – When referring to a specific governance board, use capital B (Board); when referring to board work or the governance in general terms, use lower case b (board).
8. Use Oxford commas (serial commas).
9. Tense:
    a. Use present tense (Ex: Site visit reports show…)
    b. Only use past tense when referring to something the authorizer said during the documentation debrief.
10. Refer to the authorizer by name or as "authorizer". When referring to the authorizer as a group, you may use "they". When referring to the authorizer in a singular sense, you may use "it."
11. Enumeration:
    a. Spell out 0-9, use numerals for 10 and higher.
    b. If a number starts a sentence, spell it out.

Authorizer Documents and Submission Process

Authorizers must submit documents that provide evidence of their authorizing practices. When submitting documents and files for the review, authorizers should upload documents that best demonstrate the standard in question. Authorizers are encouraged to submit the most relevant and up-to-date documentation to reflect their current expectations and practices.

School documents are randomly selected for the authorizer evaluation according to these characteristics:

- New School Applications (2) – A set of application materials from two applicants who have gone through the application process in the last 2 years.
- Charter Agreements (2) – In-force charter agreements from two operational charter schools
- Operational School documents (2):
  - Set of all oversight documentation from one or two pre five-year review schools
  - Set of all oversight documentation from one post five-year review school (if any exist)
- Renewals (2) – Set of renewal materials from two schools who have gone through the renewal process (within the last 2 years)
- Revocations (1) – Set of revocation materials from one school (if within last 2 years)
- Closure (1) – Set of closure materials from one school (if within last 2 years)

While authorizers are encouraged to use discretion when uploading documents, there are no page limits.

- If an authorizer uses a tool or process developed by the Tennessee State Department of Education, the deviations/ changes will be considered against the base evaluation of the tool.
- Narrative - Authorizers have the option to enter a brief narrative using TSBE's narrative form template. Narratives are no longer than two single-sided pages and is based on documentation. The narrative form provides the authorizer with an opportunity to rate their evidence against the rubric and describe how the evidence supports their anticipated rating. Narratives should explain ratings and **BOLD** the names of documents referenced in narrative.
- The same uploaded document can be referenced for multiple standards. Authorizers may include explanatory memos with larger documents.
- Highlighting the relevant text in the document is optional but helpful to the evaluation.
- Authorizers are asked to make sure documents and files are easy to open and easy to read. It is the authorizer's responsibility to make sure all uploaded documents and files work properly. Documents and files that cannot be opened or are unreadable could result in a lower score on a standard.
- School surveys are sent to every school leader and are an evidence source that counts as documentation.
- School leader interview notes are an evidence source and used to consider with the authorizer documentation.

Document suggestions:

Agency Commitment and Capacity

- Authorizer's or organization's strategic plan (that mentions chartering), Authorizer's charter school policies, Organizational chart, Authorizing staff job descriptions (list any/all additional job responsibilities), Biographies and résumés of staff members (and contractors), Relevant staff or Board meeting minutes and/or emails, Professional development materials, Conflict of interest policy, Signed conflict of interest statements, Authorizing-related budget (includes expenditures and revenues), Financial audits

Application Process and Decision Making

- Application rubric, Reviewer protocols, Interview information, Link to application guide and process, List of application reviewers (noting school system staff and external consultants), Biographies and résumés of reviewers, completed application review reports, Meeting minutes and/or emails

Performance Contracting

- Individual school charter agreements

Ongoing oversight and Evaluation

- Compliance requirements/compliance reporting calendar, Site visit protocol, Site visit reports, School financial audits, Intervention policy, Annual reports, Evidence of authorizer sharing annual reports with the public, Evidence of the authorizer reviewing academic, financial, and operational performance of its schools

Revocation and Renewal Decision Making

- Renewal policy, Revocation application & expectations, Evidence of any renewal or termination decisions

Authorizer Documentation Debrief Script

Welcome

- Thank you for joining us today, we appreciate having time with you to discuss documentation of your authorizing processes.
- My name is _____. I am the Evaluation Lead. I work for the Tennessee State Board of Education.
- My colleagues for this evaluation and documentation debrief are _____.

Ground Rules

- This Documentation debrief will last up to two hours.
- **The purpose for holding this authorizer documentation debrief is to give your organization an opportunity to identify how the documentation you have uploaded for the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation aligns with the criteria in the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric.**
- **It is very important to know that the authorizer documentation debrief has less impact on the evaluator ratings than documentation.** In other words, we rely on the documentation you uploaded as the primary evidence to support ratings. What you share with us during this meeting helps us to understand the documentation you have already submitted.
- We will use the first 15 minutes of this meeting and the last 5 minutes. The remainder of the scheduled time is yours.
- You have selected standards to discuss.
  - You have up to 100 minutes to present to us. We may ask clarifying questions; we will limit the time used for clarifying questions.
  - You may choose the order and length of time devoted to each standard; you may not use more than the 100 minutes allocated to you.
  - For any selected standard, you are expected to discuss the evidence (documentation) you have uploaded.
  - Your task is to discuss how the evidence/documentation meets the criteria listed in the corresponding section of the Tennessee Authorizer Evaluation Rubric. Feel free to reference the standard criteria listed on the screen.
- We have engaged in the review of the documents you uploaded as part of your quality evaluation and have evaluated them against the standards identified by the Tennessee State Board of Education. This time aims to help us understand your processes and expectations, but mainly to understand the documents you have uploaded.

Introductions

- Our team will start with introductions, then we would like to learn your names and your titles.
- I am _____, I am the Evaluation Lead.
- (Team Member) I am _____, I am the Team Member.
- (authorizer team) I am _____, I work for _____ and serve as _____.
- Thank you.
- You may use the next 100 minutes to discuss the evidence you have submitted for selected standards.
- We will close the documentation debrief with a review of Next Steps (5 minutes).

[Authorizer Time - up to 100 minutes]

Closing/Next Steps (5 minutes):

- Thank you for taking the time to meet with us. This ends the time your organization has been allocated to engage with the evaluation team.

Next Steps

- We will now finalize our ratings and evaluative comments.
- TSBE will distribute final evaluations to all authorizers in _____.
- Once you receive your final evaluation, you will have an opportunity to make factual corrections.

Authorizer Narrative Template

Standard 2a - Application proposal information, questions, and guidance
A quality authorizer:

i. Issues a charter application information packet or request for proposals (RFP) that:
   a. States any chartering priorities the authorizer may have established;
   b. Articulates comprehensive application questions to elicit the information needed for rigorous evaluation of applicants' plans and capacities; and
   c. Provides clear guidance and requirements regarding application content and format, while explaining evaluation criteria.

ii. Welcomes proposals from first-time charter applicants as well as existing school operators/replicators, while appropriately distinguishing between the two kinds of applicants in proposal requirements and evaluation criteria.

iii. Encourages expansion and replication of charter schools that demonstrate academic success, financial viability, organizational health, and capacity for growth.

iv. Considers diverse educational philosophies and approaches.

v. Requires applicants to demonstrate capacity to serve students with diverse needs, such as students with disabilities or learning exceptionalities and English learners.

Rating				
0	1	2	3	4

Narrative